DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 269 RC 006 387

TITLE	The USDA and the Disadvantaged.
INSTITUTION	Rural Sociological Society, Brookings, S. Dak.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	47p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; *Agriculture; Civil Rights; *Disadvantaged Groups; Government Publications; Research Committees; *Rural Population; *Social Discrimination; *Sociology; Training
IDENTIFIERS	*United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

ABSTRACT

Prepared by a Subcommittee of the Rural Sociological Society Development Committee, this report focuses on the policies of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)--how those policies are made and the implication of those policies for the disadvantaged in the United States. The Subcommittee assembled 2 bibliographies: (1) dealing with discrimination in connection with USDA programs and (2) dealing with large-scale organizations of which USDA is an example. Members of the Subcommittee did individual exploration in their own states to discover examples of discrimination in connection with USDA programs. Also, multiple copies of a 1 page questionnaire were sent out to key individuals in each of the 50 states. Notices were placed in social science journals indicating that the Subcommittee existed and requesting information. Evidence of discrimination by the USDA in its programs and policies in the past and of continued discrimination were found. Recommendations, placed at the beginning of this report for emphasis, include suggestions as to what individuals can do to help eliminate the problem of discrimination with respect to the disadvantaged. Furthermore, recommendations are made to members of the Rural Sociological Society describing the problem areas needing research, policy formulation, and action (areas which have some relation to equality of access to benefits of USDA programs). A bibliography with 47 entries and a list of selected studies of the disadvantaged by state agricultural experiment stations are included. (FF)

ED 066269

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The USDA and the Disadvantaged

RC 006387

The Rural Sociological Society

August 1972

The USDA and the Disadvantaged

A Report Prepared by a Subcommittee of
the Rural Sociological Society Development Committee

Members of the Subcommittee on
USDA Policies and Discrimination

Rudolph Artis
Charles L. Cleland, Chairman (1970-71)
Leonard Copeland
Gerald Klonglan, Chairman (1971-72)
Clark S. Knowlton
Joel Lazinger
William C. Payne, Jr.
George Ohlendorf
Vernon Smith
Kenneth Wilkinson
Dave Wright

Contents

Recommendations 1

The USDA and the Disadvantaged 6
Subcommittee Activities 7
Direct Contacts with USDA 9

Findings of the Subcommittee 11
Types of Discrimination 11
USDA's Complexity 13
The Fact of Past Discrimination 14
The Secretary of Agriculture 16
Congressional Committees 18

Actions Diminishing Discrimination 21
Extension Service 21
FHA 22
Other 23

Actions Increasing Discrimination 23
Extension Personnel 23
Extension Clientele 24
FHA Clientele 25
ASCS 25
Forest Service 26
Experiment Stations 26
Other 27

USDA Organization Related to Civil Rights and Discrimination . . . 27
Office of Equal Opportunity 28
Civil Rights Coordinators 28
Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights 29
Liaison Officers with 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee 29
Awareness Training for USDA 30
In-service Training 30
County-wide Reviews 31
Handling of Complaints Dealing with Discrimination 32
Office of Equal Opportunity Publication 32

Conclusions 34

Bibliography 37

Selected Studies of the Disadvantaged by State
Agricultural Experiment Stations, July 1, 1971 40

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Applicable to the Rural Sociological Society and its members

A. Individual Sociologists

1. Take the time to become familiar with and keep current on policies and programs of the USDA and other federal agencies.

2. Develop and propose public policies having to do with rural populations.

3. Seriously consider the problem areas in II below when developing new research proposals.

B. The Journal

1. The Publications Committee should consider including a section on current state and regional Experiment Station research.

2. The Publications Committee should consider including a section on current USDA and other Federal and State policies and programs including past and present budget allocations.

a. The section should include memoranda from the Secretary of Agriculture regarding civil rights.

b. The section should include relevant material from congressional hearings.

3. The Publications Committee should modify the editorial policies to encourage the inclusion of analyses of public policies.

a. Either a section of the Journal should be devoted to discussion of policies or one issue annually or a supplement should be so used.

b. Proposals made by politicians, academicians (including sociologists) and others should be printed in such section, issue or supplement.

C. Departments

1. The system of recruitment of students from disadvantaged backgrounds needs to be examined.

a. Recruitment should be more systematic.

b. Special consideration needs to be given in the awarding of assistantships.

c. Special attention should be given to orientation of such students.

d. Departmental policies concerning recruitment, financial assistance, and orientation need to be examined in light of the needs and circumstances of such students.

2. Departments should recruit more actively for faculty among minority groups and encouragement to do so might be provided by a bonus to the departmental budget for each such faculty member.

D. Annual Meetings

1. The Program Committee should include at least one session on innovative teaching programs developed to serve the needs of students from disadvantaged and minority groups at next year's meeting.

2. The Program Committee should develop one session next year on the experience of the Colleges of 1890 with the increase in funding for research and extension and the role of the USDA liaison officers in facilitating research.

3. The Program Committee should consider a session in next year's meetings on the organization of the USDA with particular attention to the locus of power, the processes by which policies get made, etc.

4. The Program Committee should develop one session dealing with the sources of funds for research by rural sociologists and the processes by which budgets for state and regional projects are established.

E. Requests of USDA

1. The Society, either through action of the Council or resolution adopted by the membership, should ask the USDA to establish an in-house research group to study the social impact of present and future policies of the USDA similar to the existing group which studies the economic impact of such policies.

2. The Society, either through action of the Council or resolution adopted by the membership, should ask the USDA to develop means (e.g., policy statements and/or budget allocations) to encourage evaluation research by rural sociologists of programs of USDA services and agencies with special attention to the Cooperative Extension Service.

II. Problem Areas Needing Research, Policies and Actions (Which have some relation to equality of access to benefits of USDA programs.)

A. Related to Colleges of 1890

1. The relations of the Experiment Stations of the Colleges of 1862 with those in the Colleges of 1890.

2. The role of the USDA Liaison Officers at the Colleges of 1890.

3. The impact of the sharp increase in the funding of research and extension at the Colleges of 1890 on internal functioning and external relations.

4. The extent of the impact on USDA policies of the National Association of Land Grant Institutions, divisions of Experiment Station and Extension Service directors, particularly with respect to the Colleges of 1890.

B. Related to Forest Service

1. Forest Service policies on use of forest resources by those interested in recreation versus those local residents interested in using them for grazing their livestock.

2. Identify methods by which participation in FS recreation programs by minorities can be increased.

C. Related to Program Control

1. Continuing evaluation of compliance with civil rights regulations.

2. Maintaining Federal control of programs to assure that their intent is carried out as increasing flexibility is permitted in adapting the means used to suit local (regional) conditions.

3. Determination of the conditions under which the local power structure can modify USDA programs for the benefit of its members or vice versa.

4. Develop a methodology by which team reviews could be made more efficient in the field and by which findings could receive wider application than in the county studied.

5. Development of a model to indicate the quantity and quality of health and medical services and facilities needed to minimize the hazard to the resident population of the occasional migrant laborer who is a disease carrier (T.B., meningitis, etc.).

6. Development of social indicators which can be used in cost-benefit ratios of proposed projects, e.g., watershed protection projects.

D. Related to Large Commercial Farm Interests Versus Those of Small Farmers and Migrant Workers

1. The relative benefits from various policies

a. Loans for carrying out soil conservation practices

b. Cooperative Extension educational programs

c. Loans for housing

d. Composition of local policy making bodies such as ASCS boards

e. Research on farm equipment and facilities

f. Marketing research and services

g. Support of cooperative enterprises

h. Structure of subsidies

i. Assistance in crew system of recruitment of farm workers

j. Individual as recipient of services rather than community or other social unit

2. Evaluation of systems for delivering services to small farmers, migrants, and other rural residents

3. Determination of extent to which farm managers (particularly for absentee owners) prevent implementation of federal programs to assist small landowners

F. Related to Specific Ethnic or Racial Minorities

1. Test the allegations that Spanish Surname ranchers in the South and Southwest because of "pride" do not participate in USDA programs such as food stamps, although they would be qualified to do so, and that they would prefer to pay full fees for grazing permits, even though free or reduced fees might be made available.

2. Study the manner and extent to which participation in USDA programs by Spanish Surname individuals is influenced by Spanish language outreach materials, Spanish speaking personnel at local offices and Spanish language descriptions of programs

3. Identify influences on attendance by Negro and Spanish Surname farmers at ASCS meetings of such factors as time and place of meeting, topic under discussion, prior advertising, and whether or not Spanish language will be used.

F. Related to Basic Institutional Structures

1. Social implications of land ownership patterns in the U.S. basic relation to land of individual vs. community control.

2. Tax structures

3. Impact of regulatory agencies being guided by groups they are supposed to regulate

G. Other

1. The changing role of USDA and its various component agencies since their establishment in terms of purpose and clientele.

2. Social and economic implications of the flight from the land on urban problems

3. Study impact on migrant workers of food stamp regulations that set monthly costs for stamps on the basis of annual earnings. What happens to migrants in the off season when they don't have cash to buy stamps? How can these problems be resolved within program regulations?

4. Development of methods of presentation of programs to close the social and economic gap between groups which minimize the feeling of discrimination by the group which is the more advantaged.

The USDA and the Disadvantaged

Item: In early August the appropriations bills for Agriculture in the House and Senate contain provisions for 8.6 million for research at the Colleges of 1890 along with 4 million for extension.

Item: Secretary of Agriculture issues Supplement No. 2 to Memorandum No. 1662 directing the heads of the various services and agencies to make certain that their programs and policies of non-discrimination are effectively communicated to minorities and the underprivileged.

These two items are illustrative of the kinds of activities given some attention in an attempt to determine just what the policies of the USDA are, how those policies are made and the implication of those policies for the disadvantaged in the U.S. The Subcommittee on USDA Policies and Discrimination was appointed by the chairman of the Development Committee in response to the following resolution passed by the Society at its 1970 annual meeting:

> that the Rural Sociological Society, in recognition of the responsibility that rural sociologists have for the consequences of their research, request that the USDA re-examine its research policies, extension service, and other pertinent programs.*

It was the understanding of the subcommittee that the charge to it was one of looking at current policies and programs of USDA and their impact on minority and disadvantaged groups with the intent of assisting USDA in developing more effective means for determining the precise effects of policies not only those currently underway but also those which are proposed as well. In this connection it was felt that the most effective approach would be to learn as much as possible about specific instances in which USDA policies were apparently discriminating and then to attempt to determine what procedure or procedures would be most effective in detecting or anticipating such

*Minutes of the 1970 Annual Meeting, Rural Sociology 35 (December): 619.

results from future policies. The orientation in short was toward the development of some types of research procedures which could help resolve the problems associated with poverty and minority groups status.

Subcommittee Activities

The subcommittee held three meetings in 1970-71. The first was in Chicago in connection with the general meeting of the Development Committee. The second was in Knoxville during the month of January; the third in early August with some support from the Rural Sociological Society. At the time of the first meeting there were three activities which the subcommittee members felt they could do immediately. The first of these was to begin the assembly of a bibliography of material dealing with discrimination in connection with USDA programs. The second had to do with a related bibliography but this one to deal with large-scale organizations of which USDA is an example. The third activity was to be individual exploration in the states from which the members of the subcommittee came to learn what they could in their own location of examples of discrimination in connection with USDA programs. All of the members of the subcommittee were to contribute to the two bibliographies as they encountered materials which would be appropriate. Bill Payne of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights already had a fair start on a bibliography dealing with discrimination in USDA policies. Joel Lazinger was to assemble the material dealing with large-scale organizations.

During the course of the meeting in January, it became clear that the responses from more than those who were members of the subcommittee would be needed in order to obtain an adequate picture of discrimination. The

means adopted to attempt to resolve this problem was that of developing a one-page questionnaire, multiple copies of which would be sent to some key individual in each of the 50 states. These questionnaires were prepared and mailed with the request that they be further distributed to some 10 knowledgeable persons in the state of residence of the recipient. At the same time it was felt that this would still have somewhat limited research value since those who would be further distributing the questionnaires would also be rural sociologists. In an attempt to overcome this difficulty, it was decided to place a notice in one or more social science journals indicating that the subcommittee was in existence and including the request for any information that was available. Such a notice appeared as a letter to the editor in the May 1971 issue of The American Sociologist.

At the suggestion of Keith Warner and with the approval of the chairman of the Development Committee, Bill Kuvlesky, the subcommittee agreed to make a progress report at one of the sessions of the annual meetings of the Society. As a subcommittee of the Development Committee, any report of the subcommittee should, of course, go first to the full Development Committee, but the matter was felt to be of sufficiently great concern that ample opportunity should be provided to the entire membership of the Society to learn what had been found by the subcommittee's exploration.

The presentation was made to the RSS at a plenary session at the Denver meeting in August 1971. Prior to such a presentation arrangements were made to share the report in its preliminary form with USDA to make it clear that the intent was one of honest but constructive and friendly criticism. The suggestions from the RSS members concerning the report given at the Denver meeting were considered by the full Development Committee at

its meeting the following October. The Development Committee instructed the subcommittee to contact the Office of Equal Opportunity within USDA to learn more of the efforts being made by the Department and to incorporate such information in the report so it might be more fully informative. Such contact was made in January, 1972, and the present report has been revised to include the information obtained. The revised report was presented to the Development Committee at its May, 1972 meeting following which some further revisions were made.

Direct Contacts with USDA: Three direct contacts with USDA were made by the subcommittee or in its behalf. These contacts have yielded strong impressions of the attitude of the former Secretary and his office. The first of these was a meeting attended by Jim Copp in which the two resolutions drafted by the RSS at its August 1970 meeting were discussed. This was apparently a very congenial meeting at which time the existence of the subcommittee making this report was indicated. There was an expression of interest in the subcommittee's activities and a willingness to make available to the subcommittee any material which might be of value to it.

The second contact was made in August 1971 to present the Assistant to the Secretary with several copies of the preliminary report before its presentation to the RSS at the Denver meeting. The reception at this time was very congenial and the Assistant to the Secretary was emphatic in his statements that the Secretary was committed to the spirit of the civil rights legislation and would do whatever he could to obtain compliance with it. This discussion took place in the presence of the newly appointed director of the Office of Equal Opportunity.

Delayed reaction to the preliminary version of this report was not quite so agreeable. In spite of the stress on the point that the report was the preliminary report of a subcommittee of the Development Committee and so had no official standing with the RSS, it was interpreted as essentially representing the RSS position on USDA and not a very well written one at that! With such an interpretation, the singling out of certain congressional subcommittee chairmen by name was seen by some as inviting disastrous cuts in appropriations in areas that the members of the RSS would like to support. In addition the support of RSS projects by USDA might be interpreted as USDA endorsement of implied criticisms of said congressmen. Unfortunately, support for the Third World Congress of Rural Sociology was being sought at that time. There was also a problem in the form of the statement of some of the "problem areas needing research, policies and actions" listed in the report. As stated, they condemned USDA before the research that was being called for to document the problem could even be proposed and one of these "accusations" turned out to be completely false!

The third contact took place in January 1972 with the personnel of the Office of Equal Opportunity. The principal purpose of this meeting was to to learn more of the extent and effectiveness of current actions being taken by USDA to eliminate discrimination. Criticisms of the preliminary form of the report were also aired. It was apparent at this meeting that the existence of the subcommittee and the report being put together was of real concern to the top administrators in USDA. This concern expressed itself in the extent to which the Equal Opportunity personnel had gone to determine the accuracy of some of the statements in the report. For example, one "problem" identified was the "reluctance of FHA to grant loans on certain adobe structures in the

Southwest." A search was made at the Washington level to determine what regulations there were concerning the granting of loans on adobe structures. No regulations were found but an engineering study of the structural characteristics of adobe was uncovered which recommended its use in areas of low rainfall. This was followed by calls to FHA offices in the Southwest to learn of restrictions applied to loans on adobe structures and no such restrictions were found. While admitting to the possibility of some local agent using such a reason to deny a loan, the Department could firmly state that FHA had no such policy and our statement was in error!

Findings of the Subcommittee

There was evidence that there has been discrimination by USDA in its programs and policies in the past and that some of this discrimination probably continues. Part of the evidence came from reports by the Civil Rights Commission, part from publications by USDA and part from responses to the subcommittee questionnaire. The specific instances of discrimination and the locus of the responsibility for such instances were frequently difficult to ascertain for reasons which will be made clear in the sections that follow.

Types of Discrimination

While there is general understanding of what the term "discrimination" means with respect to the subcommittee's activities, one of the first problems faced by the members of the subcommittee was just exactly what kinds of discrimination were to be of concern to it. The most obvious types of discrimination such as differential access to services or program benefits posed no problem. The discrimination associated with employment practices

within the various agencies of the USDA also was no problem, but there was some potential confusion associated with discrimination of employment at different levels of the organization. The kinds of discrimination which are the unintended results of program design posed a somewhat different problem which was no less real for those who were effected. The programs themselves have some built-in discrimination by intent. That is, there are certain people or persons with particular sets of circumstances who are eligible for the benefits of the program. This is, of course, discrimination but is not the type of discrimination which was of concern to the subcommittee because it is not based on race or disadvantaged status.

The time element was also seen as one facet of the problem of discrimination which needed to be kept in view. It would have been relatively easy to focus attention purely on that which is past history in terms of the Department of Agriculture's activities. Such a focus could have value only to berate or indict the Department. This was clearly not the intent of the subcommittee. Getting information on current practices, however, is somewhat more difficult but was felt to be much more germane to the subcommittee's concern. Discerning directions of emphasis with respect to the various types of discrimination was deemed to be the most important, so some reliance had to be made on statements of intent as well as upon actual current practices.

It also became clear that other federal departments should be given equal attention because they too had policies and practices which were potentially discriminatory. A particular case could be made for the Departments of Interior and Health, Education and Welfare but the charge to the subcommittee was to focus on USDA.

USDA's Complexity

The very size of the U. S. Department of Agriculture makes the number of opportunities for discrimination of the sort with which we are concerned very large indeed. According to one table made available to the members of the subcommittee, as of November 30, 1969, there were more than 85,000 full-time employees of USDA. These employees are scattered through some 12 different services and a large variety of other offices and agencies, and they are located in virtually every county of the United States. Discrimination can occur at any or all of these levels and at any or all of the various offices of the USDA's scattered across the country. Such a sprawling organization makes it difficult to pinpoint the extent of any particular type of discrimination as well as in determining just who is responsible for such discrimination.

While the USDA must bear the responsibility for the effects of its actions along with the glory of its accomplishments, it does not operate in a vacuum. It is subject to a variety of forces from outside the organization itself, the principle force being the Congress which appropriates the money for the Department's continued functioning. The USDA is also part of the larger administrative division of the Federal Government. As such, it is directly subject to the wishes of the President and his staff. There are also various agricultural groups that are organized to see that their own best interests are protected. Such groups will assert their influence principally through lobbying with the Congress, but they may also attempt to influence the interpretation of the acts of the Congress and administrative decisions within the Department of Agriculture.

Government at the state level can also have a substantial impact on the operation of some USDA programs. In cases where the state government puts up a substantial part of the funds used for programs in which USDA is a participant, the state obviously has some say about how the program is operated. This may very well include the decisions about who is employed by the operating agencies as well as which clients will be served or served most adequately. Then there is the county level. There is a strong tendency for the same forces which have a great deal of influence in local politics and social life to effect the procedures followed by the local offices of the USDA. Again, this tends to be particularly true in those programs for which the county makes some dollar input.

The Fact of Past Discrimination

Much of the material made available to the members of the subcommittee has dealt with the past policies of USDA some of which were indeed discriminatory. The United States Commission on Civil Rights has documented much of this discrimination and a number of reports are listed in the appendix. These documents indicate both how discrimination takes place and, in some instances, the extent of that discrimination. One of the most effective of these publications is entitlted Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs, published by the Civil Rights Commission in 1965. Much of this report was a statistical analysis of the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service, the Farmers Home Administration, and the ASCS. These statistics dealt primarily with the characteristics of the clients served in proportion to the total population and also with the employment of minority groups in the agency offices.

There have been other hearings held and reports made since 1965 by the Commission on Civil Rights and by state advisory commissions to the U. S. Commission. These have been primarily on a state-by-state basis with some seeking for statewide patterns but with emphasis on individual cases. From the critical nature of these reports, it would appear that there has been little attempt to cover up the activities which could be considered discriminatory by the USDA and its agencies.

There have been numerous other more recent reports as well. These have appeared in various places including the monthly paper, The South Today, published by the Southern Regional Council, Inc., in Architectural Forum, the Civil Rights Digest, and in papers presented at professional meetings of various societies. One of the most active writers and investigators in this area has been and is Professor Don F. Hadwiger of Iowa State University. He is a political scientist who has been in the South and done some interviewing on his own, and so has firsthand knowledge of some of the kinds of discrimination which have occurred. He has attempted to explain what he found in terms of the power relations of people and agencies at various levels of government.

A number of the reports made available to the subcommittee had to do with the distribution of employees with various characteristics at various levels within USDA. Most of these were concerned with blacks but there was also some concern with male-female, Spanish surnamed, Indian-American and Oriental characteristics or background. Much of this was historical in character looking, for example, at the distribution of the grades and/or wage scale of the employees. As might be expected, at the Federal level under Civil Service the practice has been to employ those who are best

prepared for the positions. This has tended to over-represent the white male population in the upper grades at the present since they have been favored in the past in educational and employment opportunities, but it says little or nothing about the current employment policies and practices of the USDA. The fact that such reports have been prepared is an indication of concern among some members of the staff and could possibly encourage a little reverse discrimination which is needed to develop a balanced representation of minority groups.

The Secretary of Agriculture*

Much of the criticism of the USDA is directed at the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no denying that he is in a position to set the tone for the functioning of the entire organization. At the same time, the very complexity which has been mentioned earlier tends to make his position and his expressions simply those of one man in a very large organization. Dr. Vivian Henderson, President of Clark College in Atlanta, speaking before the Secretary of Agriculture's Listening Conference in Athens, Georgia in July 1969, noted the limited impact of the Secretary as one of four barriers to more effective civil rights enforcement. He indicated that important decision-makers must be conscious of the political implications of their jobs, especially if their positions depend more on politics than on ability. Once programs become established, the program staff becomes ingrained into "systematic inertia" whereby a greater value is placed on the nonhuman factors of production than on the people involved and equal opportunity can be easily subverted.

*Since the presentation of the preliminary form of this report, there has been a change of Secretary, but there is no indication at the time of this revision of any change of emphasis in the Department with respect to discrimination.

It should be noted that civil rights compliance is but one part of the job of the Secretary of Agriculture which tends to be very much oriented toward getting a job done. The Civil Rights Commission is an agency which has been attempting to keep the problem of civil rights enforcement in perspective for the Secretary. Such a task could be handled in a variety of ways, and one the Commission has used is to write letters directly to the Secretary. The content of some of these letters was published as part of the "Nutrition and Human Needs," hearings before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, United States Senate, May 1969. The letter written to Mr. Hardin as he first came to office was quite lengthy and detailed and included suggestions as to what procedures might be followed. Part of the content of that letter was a comment on the effectiveness of the Office of Inspector General within the USDA. This office has apparently done an excellent job of following up on complaints to the Department about discrimination in the area of civil rights. There was some criticism of agency heads not taking action on the basis of the Office of Inspector General reports. There was also considerable comment on the system of compliance reporting with USDA agencies. The feeling at that time was that compliance reporting and review methods used did not adequately inform the Department concerning equal opportunity compliance. There have been some changes since the writing of that letter some of which are covered in this report.

The evidence available indicates that the former Secretary of Agriculture had some concern about civil rights. The content of the second supplement to the Secretary's Memorandum No. 1662 issued May 28, 1971 is

clear evidence of such concern. The first paragraph from that supplement reads as follows:

> In Secretary's Memorandum No. 1662 I directed that we renew and strengthen our efforts to ensure equal access to all USDA programs without regard to race, color, or national origin. We need to see that all eligible people, particularly minorities and the under-privileged, are informed of all USDA program benefits and of protection against discrimination contained in our regulations.

The supplement goes on to specify the means by which such efforts to inform minorities and the under-privileged are to be made. Agency heads were given approximately one month to submit a plan for accomplishing the task laid out and to submit the plans to the Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights within the Department for approval.

A fifth supplement to Memorandum 1662, dated May 18, 1972, indicates a continuing concern. It directs that "beginning with Fiscal Year 1973, USDA Agencies with Title VI or direct assistance programs will incorporate targets for the delivery of program benefits to minority groups into their advance program planning procedures." There are also to be periodic follow-ups on the progress made toward such targets with the Office of Equal Opportunity making evaluation reports.

Congressional Committees

As indicated above, the USDA operates as part of the administrative branch of the government but it is subject to various types of pressures from the legislative branch. There are two major Senate committees (Agriculture and Forestry, and Appropriations) and two major House committees (Agriculture and Appropriations) which deal with matters of concern to USDA.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has five standing subcommittees: 1) Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification, 2) Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, 3) Agricultural Research and General Legislation, 4) Soil Conservation and Forestry, and 5) a special subcommittee on Watershed Projects. The House Committee on Agriculture, is divided into six commodity oriented subcommittees plus four special subcommittees: 1) Conservation and Credit, 2) Departmental Operations, 3) Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations, and 4) Family Farms and Rural Development. The Senate and the House have Appropriations subcommittees concerned with the "Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies." Matters of policy must go through the respective committees dealing with agriculture but if there is no appropriation, there can be little action in the Department, or at least in those parts of the Department's program specifically identified in the budget. As a result, the Chairmen of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture are very influential people.

The Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture has come in for a good bit of attention in recent months and years. The present chairman is known to be quite conservative with respect to any agricultural programs which may have civil rights implications. A recent book by Nick Kotz goes into considerable detail on the Chairman's influence with respect to USDA. This book is entitled Let Them Eat Promises: The Politics of Hunger in America. Kotz is extremely critical of the Chairman, but sympathetic to the Secretary of Agriculture and the circumstances under which he has to operate.

In the June 7, 1971, issue of the Wall Street Journal there was an article by Norman C. Miller concerning the power of the Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. It this article he suggests that the Chairman's clout rivals that of the Secretary. He says that "within recent years, (the Chairman) single-handedly killed an ambitious agricultural department rural development scheme aimed particularly at upgrading the lot of poor Southern blacks." He goes on to explain that much of this influence comes from the ability of the chairmen of the various appropriations subcommittees to conduct their proceedings in complete secrecy. Even other members of the Congress are not made aware of the details of agency budgets until just a few days before House action. This gives the appropriations subcommittee chairmen a great deal of power. For the current chairman the power of the position is greatly enhanced by his thorough preparation on matters that come before his subcommittee.

Something of the principal concerns of the present chairman may be found in a statement contained in a Congressional record of December 8, 1970, as the conference report on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture was being presented. In that statement it was emphasized that agriculture is very basic to the economics of our society. At the same time, "we must take note that greater and greater numbers are quitting the farm, averaging from 600,000 to 800,000 annually. If their acreage was not farmed by the few, the larger farmers left, food would be much more scarce and much higher.

"These people are leaving the farm for urban areas because farming requires longer work hours, harder work, larger investment, higher risks, and provides a decreasing return. You can understand why when you realize that the average return on farm equities has dropped from 7.1 percent in

the period 1945-49 to 3.1 percent in 1968. Further, up until recently rural America has not offered the same advantages as have our cities, a situation we are trying to correct with loans for rural homes, rural water systems, sewage systems, adequate electricity, and so forth." Here he has gone into the reasons why people are leaving the farms. The rest of the statement deals with what Congress is trying to do to correct the problems. The problems dealt with are not those that are causing farmers to leave the farms. His concern appears to be making certain that the nation has enough agricultural production for its population. There is some secondary concern for the living conditions of the rural population, but little evidence of concern for the working conditions of the farm population. It helps to understand some of the actions and inactions of the USDA at the Federal level to know something of the convictions of so powerful a member of the House.

Actions Diminishing Discrimination

The questionnaire form sent out by the subcommittee contained three general questions. The first had to do with those activities of agencies of the USDA which tended to diminish discrimination. While only 37 of the 500 forms sent out were returned, the content of the responses was very informative. It should be stressed that the distribution of these forms was purposive rather than random and so no generalizations from them are appropriate. As might be expected, nearly all the comments had to do with the state level of operation with a very few comments about the Federal level.

Extension Service: The Cooperative Extension Service received the greatest number of comments which is due, perhaps, to the closer contact of rural sociologists with Extension than with other services. With respect to personnel, there were numerous comments about the nutrition aides being

representative of minority groups. In the state of Washington it was noted that two black home economists had been added in the past two years with one of them working with essentially middle class home demonstration clubs. There was also the note that there has been increasing involvement of minority groups in program determination in Washington. In Massachusetts it was indicated that there has been a conscientious effort to seek qualified candidates for positions from minority groups.

With respect to the clientele of Extension, a number of specific programs tending to diminish discrimination were pointed out including the city 4-H programs in New York State, the 4-H Clubs and camps in Massachusetts, cooperative programs with OEO, welfare and churches in Massachusetts, and the expanded nutrition program in virtually all of the states heard from. In addition, it was noted tht many of the community resource development programs are integrated although some are not. The nature of the means of communication used by Extension has also come in for some attention in Massachusetts where the mass media are being used in an attempt to reach all of the public segments. In Washington the brochures used by the Extension Service are being printed in Spanish as well as in English to more effectively reach that minority group.

FHA: Personnel in the Farmers Home Administration have shown some tendency to be representative of minority groups. In fact, there has come down from the Federal level a suggested procedure which would make the composition of the local boards more like the composition of the local population. Again, in the State of Washington, there has been some hiring of bilingual supervisors. Insofar as the clientele being served by the Farmers Home Administration is concerned, the percentage of black and white applicants receiving loans currently is more nearly equal than it was five years ago. There has been some increase in the loans being made available

to the poor, but it is still deemed very inadequate in terms of the needs that exist.

Other: Other agencies which were given some attention as diminishing discrimination include the Agricultural Experiment Stations and the Economic Research Service in the sense that the research on problems of the minorities and the disadvantaged has increased, even though it remains pitifully small given the magnitude of the problems. The ASCS got some attention with the comment that there had been some very slight increase in minority representation on local boards. This has been disputed with an indication that the reverse is the case. Whichever is correct, the numbers involved are so small that any shift is scarcely worth noting. One respondent noted that the cost sharing practices were helping the disadvantaged. There was some disagreement with this on the part of others. It was also noted that the welfare and food distribution programs are helping to equalize the distribution of material goods. Finally, there was one comment that said the recruitment of Federal employees was being actively carried on among minority students, even though the results are not impressive.

Actions Increasing Discrimination

Extension Personnel: There were more comments about activities which tend to increase discrimination than there were about those which diminish it. With respect to personnel in Extension, there was only one comment dealing with the Federal level. This had to do with the location of offices in the District of Columbia which makes difficult the problem of housing for minority professionals. There was also a comment from one respondent that the current emphasis on employment practices actually discriminates against middle class whites. One comment had to do with the allocation

of Extension funds. The fact that the allocation is almost entirely through white land-grant colleges was seen as automatically discriminating against nonwhites. At the state level there was an indication that the discrimination against blacks occurs principally in terms of advancement, training and in office facilities. In North Carolina in particular the number of black positions has been reduced, the jobs assigned to blacks are for work which deals only with minorities, there is virtually no recruitment of blacks currently, the promotion policies ignore blacks, the blacks are excluded from budget-making, personnel rating and decisions concerning the hiring of new personnel.

Extension Clientele: With respect to the clientele of Extension, a number of comments dealt with the general focus of Extension as being on productivity rather than on people. Others characterized this as being an orientation to agri-business and to commercial farmers. It was suggested that there is little concern shown for those who are displaced from agriculture and it is commonly assumed that small farms are simply not feasible from any point of view and so are not worthy of Extension's attention. There was some comment that state and local staffs tend to be very unsympathetic to programs for the poor and the small farmer and to those who work in such programs. Concern was expressed for the inadequate "outreach" to disadvantaged persons. There was also a suggestion that the coordination of Extension with other agencies was very inadequate. While other states may have had some of the same sorts of problems, attention was called to the separate operations of black and white programs in North Carolina with an indication that there appears to be state support for the resulting disproportionate services to whites. There was a specific comment about home demonstration clubs tending

to be strongly middle-class oriented. There was also an examination of some of the interest areas of 4-H Club programs with the note that those dealing with horses, snowmobiles and others involving rather expensive equipment or facilities are very obviously oriented toward the interests of the affluent.

FHA Clientele: The Farmers Home Administration also came in for some criticism at least with respect to the clientele it is serving. The specific comments had to do with the lack of support for cooperative communities, with excessive delays for loan approval which makes a farce of loans to cooperatives of low-income people, with interest rates being too high, particularly with respect to economic opportunity and cooperative loans and with the structure of emergency (disaster) loans which is alleged to cause the poor to pay back a larger percentage of the loans than the rich. There was also comment about the lack of funds allocated for loans to small farmers.

ASCS: In connection with personnel, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service was mentioned as one which has very few blacks on local committees. The ASCS did come in for considerable mention concerning the discriminatory effect of its programs on its clientele. Specifically it was pointed out that the crop allotment, price support and diversion payment programs tend to benefit large, mechanized operators much more than they do the small operators. The Agricultural Conservation Program which is administered by the ASCS was mentioned. The situation here is that although there is a higher percentage of the cost of the practices for which the farmer who is poor is reimbursed, the means for achieving such higher percentage payment is to reduce the acreage involved in the program so that the total amount paid to the farmer remains constant. In other words, the size of the acreage included in the program is reduced so that the payment does indeed

equal, say, 80 percent (rather than the usual 50 percent) of the cost of the practice when there is a larger area that should have been included. The problem of sharecroppers taking advantage of the ACP program was also commented upon. In this case the payments are made only for improvements to the real estate and, since the sharecropper does not own the real estate but must contribute something to the cost of the improvement, he would, in a sense, be contributing to the welfare of the landowner who may or may not recognize such contributions.

Forest Service: The program of the U. S. Forest Service was mentioned by two of the respondents as being discriminatory with respect to some of the minority and disadvantaged groups, particularly in the Southern Rockies. It was indicated that the thrust of the Forest Service programs is toward the large-scale, capital intensive, export oriented use of the biotic resources of the region. Such a thrust gives little opportunity for recognition of cultural differences and the kinds of skills available in the manpower of minority groups in the region. ERS reportedly has an input-output matrix designed to measure the impact of a program on an area that could be used to examine this problem.

Experiment Stations: The Agricultural Experiment Stations were also included in the comments dealing with increasing discrimination. It was noted that the research emphasis tends to be on new and capital intensive technology rather than on the types of programs which would be of direct benefit to smaller farmers. It was noted, however, that there was an indirect benefit to the smaller farmers through the lower cost of food. An additional comment was that even black land-grant colleges' research tends to be oriented toward the large farm operators rather than toward the disadvantaged whether or not they happen to black.

Other: There were some other comments which did not have to do directly with the discriminatory practices which might be related to USDA agencies. One of these called attention to the fact that local administrators may be very discriminatory when they fail to take advantage of some of the programs that are offered. Another respondent rather misinterpreted the intent of the questionnaire when he responded that there had been only one black family in the county, and since they had moved, the questionnaire did not apply. He apparently did not recognize that other families can be disadvantaged as well. One respondent suggested that the questions that were asked needed to be rephrased to make them more researchable. He suggested that we should have asked the following: 1) What responsibilities do blacks have as it relates to personnel, policies and budget? 2) What changes have occurred in the amount of time or assistance given black clientele over some recent time period? 3) How many positions held by blacks in 1965 have been discontinued? 4) How many positions held by whites in 1965 were discontinued? These are all good questions for which there should be some answers.

USDA Organization Related to Civil Rights and Discrimination

Given the size and complexity of USDA it is not surprising that a formal structure was established to assure that matters relating to civil rights and discrimination were given due attention. The Office of Equal Opportunity is the most visible part of this structure, but there are also Civil Rights Coordinators in each USDA agency, a Citizens Advisory Committee, Liaison Officers with the 1890 Institutions, awareness training, in-service training and county-wide reviews. Each of these will be dealt with briefly below.

Office of Equal Opportunity: The Office of Equal Opportunity is physically located in the South Building in Washington and currently has an Office of the Director and three divisions: Program Evaluation, Compliance and Enforcement, and Contract Compliance. A new division is projected for fiscal 1973, that of Program Planning and Development.

The Office of the Director has three professional staff members and three clerical employees. The Program Evaluation Division with two professional and two clerical employees has responsibility for evaluation of data on participation in USDA programs by ethnic groups along with certain other responsibilities. The Compliance and Enforcement Division with nine professional and five clerical employees monitors the Civil Rights compliance activity in USDA programs, monitors complaints and seeks ways to improve outreach. The Contract Compliance Division with 41 employees, not all of whom are Civil Rights experts, plans and directs the Department's equal employment opportunity program in Government contracts and Federally assisted construction contracts along with coordinating the enforcement of the contract compliance provisions of Executive Order 11246.

Civil Rights Coordinators: Each USDA agency has designated a Civil Rights Coordinator to act as liaison between the Agency and the Office of Equal Opportunity. There were 26 coordinators as of December 16, 1971, and their names and addresses were supplied to the subcommittee. In agencies with major civil rights responsibilities, coordinators serve on a full-time basis. In the smaller agencies, the coordinator handles civil rights matters in addition to his regularly assigned duties. In general, coordinators assist the agency administrator in the development and monitoring of equal opportunity policies and procedures for the agency. Many coordinators

maintain close working relationships with minority organizations in order to increase minority program participation, but they are limited in what they can do.

Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights: The Secretary's Memorandum No. 1709, of October 2, 1970, established a Citizens Advisory Committee on Civil Rights. This committee is 1) to review all aspects of the Department's policies, practices, and procedures that promote equal opportunity, 2) to advise the Secretary of the effectiveness of program directives that are designed to achieve compliance and 3) to recommend changes in Department rules, regulations and orders to assure that Departmental activities are free of racial discrimination. The names and addresses of the 15 members of this committee, three women and twelve men, were supplied to the subcommittee. The committee has made no recommendations to date.

Liaison Officers with 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee: The presidents of the 1890 Institutions and Tuskegee met with the Secretary of Agriculture and other top USDA officials on February 25, 1970 and agreement was reached to 1) have a mutually acceptable USDA employee located at each institution to further cooperative programs in the best interest of all concerned and 2) to form a joint 1890-USDA Committee to work on details for these cooperative programs. The liaison officers, who are paid by the agencies from which they come, perform a wide range of functions depending on needs at the local institution. Some liaison officers teach, do research, find employment opportunities for students and perform various public relations functions. An important aspect of their work is to keep open channels of communication between the 1890 and the 1862 institutions as well as with USDA.

Awareness training for USDA personnel: Secretary's Memorandum No. 1662, issued September 23, 1969, named the Director of Personnel as the person responsible for developing adequate and appropriate training in civil rights for the Secretary's staff, the Agency heads and their deputies. The memorandum directed that each Agency head, after consultation with the Director of Personnel, would be responsible for developing and conducting training courses in this area for his division heads and regional, State, and major field office heads. This phase of training was concluded June 30, 1971. The number of USDA employees that received training under this phase of the program was 65,584.

This type of training will be an on-going function in the Department. The Office of Personnel is in the final stages of developing and implementing a training program, employing the best aspects of programs developed by Agencies for Department-wide use.

In-service Training: Secretary's Memorandum No. 1768, issued February 28, 1972, established a task force on upward mobility. This task force is under the co-chairmanship of persons from the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Office of Personnel. The function of the Task Force is to analyze existing upward mobility programs, assess their effectiveness, and recommend a co-ordinated program for the Department. The Government Employees Training Act provides the Department and its Agencies flexibility to offer training to employees through non-government facilities. In addition individual agencies have developed effective training programs with the SCS and FS being particularly noteworthy. The SCS program begins with recruitment of high school seniors to spend the summer following graduation working for SCS.

This is followed by study in Agricultural Colleges and employment by SCS. The Forest Service has a similar plan for recruitment and training both on-the-job and in formal classes. Progress in this program is sure, but the rate of change achieved thus far is slow.

County-wide reviews: County-wide reviews of USDA programs involving State and Federal officials are made to determine whether programs are being administered in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Department's Rules and Regulations and Secretary's Memorandum No. 1662. The review also serves to evaluate the effectiveness of Agency methods and procedures to deliver USDA programs to eligible minority group participants and beneficiaries. The reviews are conducted by a team composed of three or four specialists from the Compliance and Enforcement Division, Office of Equal Opportunity and four employees from the Agencies that are operating major programs in the county. Typically, the Agency team members might be from the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Extension Service, Farmers Home Administration and the Food and Nutrition Service. Only two have been carried out thus far, due partly to staffing limitations.

During the on-site review, the entire team participates jointly in interviews with State, local and Federal officials and minority leaders. After these meetings are conducted, individual team members conduct portions of the review as assigned by the team leader. These assignments normally coincide with the team member's program affiliation. On-the-spot corrective action is taken, whenever possible. The on-site review is completed in nine days.

At the completion of the on-site review, a report is written for the Secretary. The report contains the findings and recommendations of the team. Some time after the report has been issued, a follow-up visit is made to the county by one of the OEO team members to determine what corrective action has been taken by the Agency.

Handling of Complaints Dealing with Discrimination: Any person who feels he has been discriminated against in a USDA program may file a complaint. Each USDA and cooperating office is required to display a poster informing people of their right to file a complaint. Even so, there is no way of being certain that all staff members fully understand such an opportunity. Formal investigations of complaints are conducted by personnel located in five regional offices of the Office of the Inspector General. Preliminary field inquiries into certain complaints are often conducted by Agency personnel. Upon occasion, specialists from the Office of Equal Opportunity, Compliance and Enforcement Staff, conduct the inquiry. Since only six specialists are currently assigned, the staff is limited in its ability to participate in complaint inquiries. The staff does review all investigation and inquiry reports and recommends corrective action when necessary.

Office of Equal Opportunity Publication: A report issued in July 1971 entitled Participation in USDA Programs by Ethnic Groups has been supplemented by the OEO Annual Report: 1971 issued in July 1972. This report is based on the various agencies in each state. This report has a series of tables for each of the services of the USDA with the breakdown by racial and/or ethnic groups for most of the data with the breakdown by sex on selected items. Since such a report is based on self-reporting, it must, of course, be taken with some skepticism. At the same time there is evidence that the efforts

made at the Federal level to assure accuracy in the statistics have been fairly vigorous. Much of the data in the tables is comparative between a recent period and one which was two or three years or more in the past. Most of the data seem to indicate that there has been a reduction in discrimination, both in terms of personnel employed by the agency and in the clientele being served. One of the tables contains the figures documenting the reduction mentioned by one of the survey respondents in the number of black employees, professionals, in the Extension Service in North Carolina in recent years. The inclusion of such figures again suggests the attempt at accuracy by the USDA in presenting information which might otherwise be detrimental to it.

Requests for copies may be sent to Mr. Jerome Shuman, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, USDA, Washington, D. C. 20250.

Conclusions

In light of the material contained in this report, it is apparent that there can be no blanket condemnation of the U. S. Department of Agriculture or any other department of the federal government with respect to the discriminatory effect of many of its policies and programs. It is apparent that the only condition under which there is no discrimination is that of no program and no action. USDA has many programs going and some discrimination has occurred either as an effect of the program or in the means used to implement the program. As an agency of the government, the USDA must respect the interests of all of the citizens and be willing to accept responsibility for the problems created by the programs it administers as well as to take credit for the success of such programs. This is not an easy task, but someone is responsible for the decisions made and actions taken even though others in subordinate positions may have had some influence. The Department has a responsibility for assessing the impact of its programs and making those responsible for any deleterious affects aware of the results of their actions or inactions, whether they be the legislators who drew up the legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture or the Clerk in an FHA office.

Since discrimination can occur at many levels within federal departments and may be either internal or with respect to the clients externally, it is essential that the specific population being discriminated against by a particular program or policy be specified. There is evidence that the former Secretary of Agriculture devoted some attention to the problem of civil rights compliance within USDA, but problems remain. It is also apparent that at the Federal and state levels the impact of members of the respective legislatures must be taken into account. The attitudes and actions or inactions

of administrative officials at both levels must also be considered. While such considerations may explain why a given problem exists, they do not justify the existence of the problem.

There is conviction that discrimination against the disadvantaged is still a problem. These feelings are based largely on the very difficult conditions of individuals and groups which have developed through no apparent fault of their own. The assumption is that some form of discrimination is responsible. Specific instances of discrimination and the precise source of such discrimination turn out to be very elusive and the limited resources available to the subcommittee were insufficient to make clear cut determinations.

One contribution from this subcommittee's effort has been the sorting out of the various types of discrimination which are possible. This division into the types dealing with internal personnel problems on the one hand versus those dealings with clients on the other, is perhaps the most critical. The latter must, of course, take into account not only the numbers involved but also the quality of the services which are rendered. The level at which the discrimination takes place must also be taken into account, that is, whether it is at the Federal, the state, or the purely local level. It is apparent that while the effects may be essentially comparable regardless at which level the discrimination takes place, the level must be understood if an analysis of the situation is to be meaningful and proposed solutions are to be effective.

There remains the question of how to design research which would be of value to USDA in helping it to more effectively reach the clientele most in need of its services. There is evidence that USDA is sympathetic to such an effort. It is also evident that some distinction must be made between studies to determine what is occuring and those which would be oriented toward the impact of future policies. It is anticipated that the latter will be of the greatest value in the long run, but they must, of course, be based upon knowledge of what is currently occurring. Research which is descriptive of the current situation must attempt to determine the impact at the various levels of particular policies of USDA, while that which is future oriented must be concerned primarily with the thrust or the direction of the programs and the types of designs which would most effectively reach the target population.

The recommendations which have been placed at the beginning of this report for emphasis are suggestions as to what individuals can do to shed additional light on or help to eliminate the problem of discrimination with respect to the disadvantaged. In part this is recognition that we need to make certain that our own house is clean before we launch into criticism of others. It is also recognition that what we do as individual professionals and as a professional society can have a substantial impact on policies and practices of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. This is a challenge and a responsibility. It's your move!

Bibliography

Arnson, Bernie, "Enforcement--The Continuing Struggle, "Mountain Life and Work: The Magazine of The Appalachian South, Vol. XLVI, No. 9, October 1970.

Baldwin, Sidney, Poverty and Politics.

Barker, Horace and Robert E. Anderson, Jr., Equal Housing Opportunities in the South: A Challenge, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, July 1971.

Congressional Record, House H 11301-11306, December 8, 1970.

Copp, James H., "Poverty and Our Social Order: Implications and Reservations," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 52 (December, 1970), pp. 736-744.

Denton, Rob, "USDA Policies and Discrimination," 1971 Winter Term Project Report, University of Tennessee.

Economic Research Service, USDA, Rural Poor Who Could Benefit from Job Training in the East North Central States, Agricultural Economic Report No. 204, April 1971.

Economic Research Service, USDA, Research Data on Minority Groups: An Annotated Bibliography of Economic Research Service Reports: 1955-1965, Miscellaneous Publication 1046, November 1966.

Economic Research Service, USDA, An Economic Survey of the Appalachian Region, Agricultural Economics Report No. 69.

Garnett, Bernard E., "Non-White Farmers Hit USDA Policies," Race Relations Reporter, Vol. 2, No. 13, July 19, 1971.

Griffith, Kitty, "USDA: It Remains Government's Worst Civil Rights Offender," South Today, Vol. 1, No. 5, November 1969, p. 4.

Hadwiger, Don F., "Appointed Black Office Chiefs in Rural Communities with Black Populations," (Dittoed, 23 pages).

_____, "Blacks and the Department of Agriculture," (Updated, processed copy, 22 pages).

_____, "Continuing Education for Disadvantaged Employees of the USDA" (Undated, Xeroxed copy, 18 pages plus 2 page summary).

_____, "Farmers Home Administration Services to Negroes" (Undated, mimeographed, 25 pages).

_____, "Rural Liberals in the Black Spotlight," paper presented at meeting of American Historial Association, December 30, 1969. (Later revision published as "Freemen and the Poor," Agricultural History, January 1971).

_____, "Washington Research Project Report on Employment and Services by Race in the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service" (1970, Xeroxed copy, 10 pages).

Kotz, Nick, Let Them Eat Promises: The Politics of Hunger in America, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1971.

Miller, Norman C., "Representative Jamie Whitten Works Behind Scence to Shape Big Spending," Wall Street Journal, June 7, 1971.

Nelson, Bardin H., "The Design and Execution of Research Projects Involving Predominately White and Negro Institutions of Higher Learning," Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Information Report No. 71-5, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A & M University, 1971.

"Nutrition and Human Needs," Hearings Before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, U. S. Senate, Part 8, May 1969. Material on USDA Civil Rights Enforcement: Correspondence with Secretaries Freeman and Hardin, pp. 2682-2718.

Payne, William, "Food for First Citizens," Civil Rights Digest, Fall 1969, pp. 1-4.

_____, "Job Opportunity for Farm Agents," Civil Rights Digest, Fall 1968, pp. 13-15.

_____, "Let Them East Promises," (book review) Civil Rights Digest, Winter 1970.

_____, "Mexican American Farmers: Victims of Neglect," Civil Rights Digest, Spring 1969, pp. 37-38.

_____, "One in 4,000 or a Federal Farm Agency Makes Progress," Civil Rights Digest, Summer 1968, p. 26.

_____, "The Hungry School Child," Civil Rights Digest, Summer 1968, pp. 19-20.

_____, "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," Civil Rights Digest, Spring 1970, pp. 12-17.

_____, "There is a Hunger Here," Civil Rights Digest, Winter 1969, pp. 38-43.

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind, U. S. Government Printing Office, September 1967.

"Recruiting and Placing Non-White Employees as a Principal Method of Improving USDA Services to Non-Whites" (Mimeographed, 6 pages, author unknown).

Southern Rural Research Project (Box 956, Selma, Alabama, 36701), "Black Farm Families--Hunger and Malnutrition in Rural Alabama," 1968.

_____, "The Extinction of the Black Farmer in Alabama."

"Trends Affecting Rural Institutions," talk by C. B. Ratchford (Vice President for Extension, University of Missouri), at Annual Agricultrural Outlook Conference, Washington, D. C., February 18, 1969.

U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Opportunity in Farm Programs, 1965.

_____, Equal Opportunity in Federally Assisted Agricultural Programs in Georgia, 1967.

_____, The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in the Alabama Black Belt, 1968.

_____, "The Mechanisms for Implementing and Enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: U. S. Department of Agriculture," 1968.

_____, Hearings on Problems of Economic Security for Negroes in Rural Alabama, 1968.

_____, Cycle to Nowhere, 1968 (Clearinghouse publication based on Alabama Hearings).

_____, "Equal Opportunity in the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service," 1969.

USDA Civil Rights Staff, Participation in USDA Programs by Ethnic Groups, July 1971.

U. S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, The Economic and Social Condition of Rural America in the 1970's, U. S. Government Printing Office, May 1971.

Untitled remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin opening the National Agricultural Outlook Conference, USDA, Washington, D. C., February 17, 1969.

Untitled statement of Dr. Vivian W. Henderson before the Agricultural Listening Conference at University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, July 24, 1969.

Upchurch, M. L., "Progress in Resolving the Problem of Rural Poverty," Journal of Farm Economics, 1964, p. 429 ff.

Washington Research Project (1823 Jefferson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036), Farmers Home Administration Rural Housing Loans and the Black Borrower, 1970.

SELECTED STUDIES OF THE DISADVANTAGED BY
STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS
JULY 1, 1971

Alabama	
Hatch 318	Impact of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Educational Program on Low-Income Homemakers in Selected Alabama Counties
Arizona	
Hatch 4163-017	Low-Income Families as Consumers
Hatch 4163-154	The Family as a Unit for Experimental Intervention
Arkansas	
Hatch 693	Changes in the Socioeconomic Status of Families in Low-Income, High Migration Rural Areas
State 722	Program Income Eligibility Variation Effects on Social Behavior of Participants
California	
Hatch 2767	Analysis of Deteriorating Casual Labor Market: Primarily Day Haul Farm Labor
Hatch 2768	Identification of Physical Settings Fostering Town and Farm Reared Children's Use of and Adjustment to Day Care and/or Preschool Programs
Hatch 2770	Agriculture's Economic Structure and Rural Poverty
Illinois	
Hatch 05-330	Economic Analysis of Factors in the Development of Low-Income Regions of Illinois
Hatch 05-334	Economic Analysis of Off-Farm Earnings as a Factor in the Improvement of Low-Income Farmers
Indiana	
Hatch 1635	Adjustment Strategies of Farmers in Economic Classes 3, 4, and 5
Iowa	
State 1742	Profile of the Disadvantaged in Iowa
State 1861	Evaluation of Public Policy Outputs in Rural America

State 1871	Adaptation to Aging in Small Towns
Kentucky	
Hatch 801	Value Orientations and Career Plans of Young People in Various Socioeconomic Situations
Louisiana	
Hatch 1147	Characteristics and Problems of the Aged in a Diffused Rural Society
Hatch 1552	Economic Feasibility of Organizing, Financing and Managing Marketing and Supply Cooperatives for Low-Income Farmers and Rural Area Residents
Hatch 1555	An Economic Evaluation of Credit and Financial Resource Problems of Low-Income Farmers and Rural Residents in Selected Areas of Louisiana
State 1352	The Relationship Between Poverty and Clothings as Social Stigma
Michigan	
Hatch 1005	The Mexican-American Migrant Farm Worker in Transition
Hatch 1076	Michigan Food Stamp Plan--Case Analysis of Some Associated Impacts Upon Participants and Their Communities
Hatch 1084	Nutritional Status of Children Attending Michigan Day Care Centers
Mississippi	
Hatch 237	Opportunities for Rural Development in Low-Income Areas of Mississippi
Hatch 1936	Socio-Cultural and Situational Factors in Poverty in Selected Rural Areas in Mississippi
Missouri	
Hatch 30	Rural Poverty--Its Causes, Implications and Alleviation
Montana	
Hatch 459	The Differential Impact of Low Family Income on Educational and Occupational Aspirations, Expectations, Plans and Achievements of Rural and Indian Students

Nebraska

Hatch 93-9	The Disadvantaged and Educationally Retarded Child of the American Indian Family

New Mexico

State 440	An Evaluation of the Natural and Human Resources of Low-Income Spanish-American Families and Their Potential Contribution to the Economic and Social Development of Northcentral New Mexico
State 474	A Socio-Economic Analysis of Institutions, Values and the Economy of a Poverty Region: Northcentral New Mexico
State 423	The Development and Evaluation of Field Methods and Techniques for Increasing the Effectiveness of Training Family Home Consultants
State 484	Economic Feasibility of Potential Crops and Livestock Enterprises for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project

New York

State 159410	Social Service Delivery Systems for Seasonal Agricultural Workers

North Carolina

Hatch 13325	Analysis of Decision Making and Communications Patterns of Disadvantaged Farm Families in the North Carolina Coastal Plains Development Area
Hatch 13323	Consumer Preference, Choice, and Decision-Making Behavior of Rural Low-Income Families in the Housing, Food, Clothing and Durable Goods Market

Ohio

Hatch 380	Cost of Delivering Selected Community Services and Facilities of Various Qualities in the 28 Appalachian Counties of Ohio
Hatch 369	Impact of the Food Stamp Program on Family Use of Resources and Family Well-Being
Hatch 417	A Socio-Economic Analysis of the Migrant Labor Situation in Northwest Ohio

Pennsylvania

Hatch 1784	Low-Income People of Rural Pennsylvania, Resources and Opportunities for Improvement

Puerto Rico

Hatch 202	Socio-Economic Study of the "Aggregado" Families and Those that Have Been Resettled in Rural Areas

South Carolina

Hatch 844	The Nature and Incidence of Rural Low Incomes in the Eastern Coastal Plain Area of South Carolina

Tennessee

Hatch 333	Evaluation and Improvement of Low Cost Rural Housing in Tennessee

Texas

State 1839	Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service Intensified Farm Planning Program for Low-Income Farmers

Utah

State 792	Factors Associated with Relative Vocational Success of Navajo High School Graduates

Washington

Hatch 0096	Socioeconomic Consequences of Seasonal Unemployment in Forest Oriented Communities
State 21	Educational and Social Performance of Indian Children
State 1973	Racial Discrimination and Conflict in a High School
State 1934	Ethnic Acceptance versus Discrimination: Causes of and Consequences for Students from Mexican-American Migratory Labor Families

Regional (Multi-State) Projects

W-113	Improvement of Employment Opportunities and Earnings for Disadvantaged People in Non-Metropolitan Areas
W-114	Institutional Structures for Improving Rural Community Services
W-118	Economic and Social Significance of Human Migration for the Western Region
S-63	Influences on Occupational Goals of Young People from Three Sub-Cultures in the South

S-64	Nutritional Interrelationships of Minerals and Other Deficiencies Characteristic of Low-Income Groups in Southeastern United States
S-66	Physical, Social and Economic Aspects of Functional Housing for Low-Income Families
S-79	Rural Development and the Quality of Life in the Rural South
S-81	Development of Human Resource Potentials of Rural Youth in the South and Their Patterns of Mobility
NE-58	An Economic and Sociological Study of Agricultural Labor in the Northeast
NE-68	Paths Out of Poverty
NE-77	Community Services for Non-Metropolitan People in the Northeast
NC-90	Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families